

REMARKS

Claims 3-5, 12, and 16-23 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 3-5, 12, 16, and 17-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kameya et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,128,588). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

a) According to the cited reference Kameya (USP No. 5,128,588, hereinafter referred to as Kameya), although the portion 5, which the Examiner regards as a metal foil, has a wave portion, it is provided outside of the sealing portion. On the other hand, the corrugated structure of the present invention is provided in the sealing portion. Thus, the rejections under 35 USC 102 should not be applied to the instant application.

(b) The Examiner has incorrectly asserted that the reference numeral 5 is a metal foil in Kameya; the reference numeral 5 denotes an external lead wire, and the metal foil is denoted by the reference numeral 4 (see column 3, lines 7-13). These components have clearly different functions. In Applicants' invention, the metal foil contributes to sealing. Specifically, by plastically deforming the metal foil in a glass, it is possible to seal the sealing portion (see page 2, line 21 to page 3, line 3 of the present specification).

On the other hand, the external lead wire is a flexible metal piece like a cord (see column 3, lines 11-13 of Kameya), and most of the portions of the wire are outside of the sealing portion so as not to contribute to sealing.

As described above, the metal foil is in the sealing portion and greatly contributes to sealing. The corrugated structure is provided on the metal foil so as to improve resistance to pressure.

Hence, since the lamp disclosed in Kameya does not have the wave portion of the metal foil in the sealing portion, Kameya cannot achieve the effect of improving resistance to pressure of the sealing portion. Thus, the present invention is patentable over Kameya.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Sept 22, 2003

By: Greg Stobbs
Gregory A. Stobbs
Reg. No. 28,764

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GAS/kk